



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/691,609

10/24/2003

Jennie Ching

SEQ03 006

7200

7590

08/17/2006

DUANE MORRIS LLP

Suite 700

1667 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

EXAMINER

RUTLEDGE, AMELIA L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 08/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/691,609

Applicant(s)

CHING ET AL.

Examiner

Amelia Rutledge

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed 05/15/2006.
2. Claims 1 and 3-17 are pending in the case. Claims 1 and 8 are independent claims. Claim 2 has been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Interwoven (hereinafter "Interwoven"), "XML in a Content Infrastructure: Conducting Business on the Web", copyright 2001, Interwoven, in view of Christel, et al. (hereinafter "Christel"), "XSLT for Tailored Access to a Digital Video Library", copyright June 2001, ACM.**

Independent claim 1 cites: *A method of defining a customizable asset metadata file usable by a web-based asset management application, comprising:*

a. providing an asset metadata template for an asset type in an Extensible Markup Language ("XML") schema file, the XML schema file comprising a description of metadata fields and corresponding field type and field length for the asset type, and a specifier to signify at least one of (a) whether a field is optional or searchable or both or (b) whether an asset can be handled by a media player through the browser,

Art Unit: 2176

Christel teaches a system for managing the asset metadata of a digital video library using XML schema specifying field length and type as well as XSL asset metadata stylesheets (p. 294, Sect. 3.1). While Christel does not explicitly teach an asset metadata template for capturing metadata, Interwoven teaches an XML asset metadata template for capturing metadata (p. 4-5, Sect. 1.2, Figure 2, and Example 1). Interwoven teaches a description of metadata fields in the XML schema file for the template and a specification of field type (p. 13, Sect. 4, and Example 4).

Christel teaches that the schema uses the Dublin Core framework which can be used to signify whether a field is optional or searchable or both, as was well known in the art at the time of the invention (p. 298, Sect. 4, Col. 1, par. 2-4). Christel discloses a schema designating an optional field at p. 294, col. 2, par. 2-5, see In. <element type="score" maxOccurs="1" />...and the passage: *These schema definitions limit "score" to appearing at most once for each document...* Therefore, Christel designates the field "score" as optional by specifying a specific "maxOccurs" value.

Further, Christel discloses specifying whether a field is searchable because Christel discloses the use of a relevance score field for searching (p. 295, col. 2, par. 1).

Further, Christel discloses an XSL style sheet designating a searchable field at p. 294, col. 2-p. 295, col. 1. Christel teaches that the schema specifies whether an asset can be handled by a media player through the browser, by specifying the media format, for example. The attached reference "Using Dublin Core", Hillman, issued July 6, 2000, Dublin Core Metadata Initiative, at

<http://dublincore.org/documents/2000/07/16/usageguide>; describes in detail the Dublin

Art Unit: 2176

Core metadata framework which was well known in the art at the time of the invention.

For example, the Format element of the Dublin Core framework includes the media-type of the resource and may be used to determine the software, hardware, or other equipment needed to display or operate the resource (Hillman, p. 9, sect. 4.13).

Claim 1 also cites: *b. providing an XSL asset creation process stylesheet file that can be used with an XML schema file, the XSL asset creation process stylesheet file adapted to traverse the XML schema file and create a form displayed in a user interface based on a field specified in the XML schema file; and*

Christel teaches an XSLT implementation to create a user interface based on the XML schema (p. 294-295, Sect. 3.1). While Christel does not explicitly teach creating a form, Interwoven teaches the use of XSL with an XML schema file to create a form, as would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, Interwoven does not explicitly teach the implementation of the XSL transformation (XSLT) used to create the form based on the XML schema file.

Claim 1 also cites: *c. providing an XSL asset metadata layout stylesheet, the XSL asset metadata layout stylesheet further comprising an XSL asset metadata display definition for an asset type in the XSL asset metadata layout stylesheet.*

Christel teaches an XSL stylesheet for asset metadata layout with display definitions for asset types (p. 294-295, Sect. 3.1).

Both Christel and Interwoven are directed toward the management of asset metadata using XML and XSL. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Interwoven to Christel, so that the user would

Art Unit: 2176

have the benefit of an easy to use interface that allows users to enter content into form fields and then automatically output the content in XML (Interwoven, p. 4, par. 5).

Regarding dependent claims 3-5, Christel teaches XML schema specifying field length and type for multiple asset types as well as XSL asset metadata stylesheets (p. 294, Sect. 3.1). Christel teaches multiple schema files associated with asset types, for example schema to enhance views with match data (p. 295, Sect. 3.2).

Regarding dependent claim 6, Christel teaches XSL with layout information useful for displaying metadata for a specified asset (p. 294-295, Sect. 3.1).

Regarding dependent claim 7, while Christel does not explicitly teach layout information including a designator indicative of which fields should be displayed to a user creating or modifying asset metadata, Interwoven teaches asset locking models indicating which fields can be edited or displayed to a user (p. 10, Sect. 3.1, "Locking"). Interwoven also teaches versioning for parallel development and update of assets (p. 11, par. 3.3). Compare to *the layout information further comprises a designator indicative of which fields should be displayed to a user that is creating a new asset or modifying an existing asset's metadata*.

Regarding independent claim 8, the limitations "a" through "c" of claim 8 are substantially similar to limitations "a" through "c" of claim 1 and are rejected along the same rationale. Claim 8 also adds limitation "d" which cites:

d. a web-based application adapted to utilize the asset metadata XML schema file and the XSL asset creation process stylesheet file when performing an XSL transformation that displays an input form for a user to enter asset metadata

Art Unit: 2176

information.

While Christel teaches a web based application for managing the asset metadata of a digital video library using XML schema and XSL asset metadata stylesheets, Christel does not explicitly teach displaying an input form for a user to enter asset metadata information. However, Interwoven teaches an XML asset metadata template for capturing metadata from a user via a form interface (p. 4-5, Sect. 1.2, Figure 2, and Example 1). Both Christel and Interwoven are directed toward the management of asset metadata using XML and XSL. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Interwoven to Christel, so that the user would have the benefit of an easy to use interface that allows users to enter content into form fields and then automatically output the content in XML (Interwoven, p. 4, par. 5).

Regarding dependent claim 9, claim 9 is directed to substantially similar subject matter as claimed in dependent claim 3, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 10, while Christel teaches a metadata field for defined assets of a specific asset type, Christel does not explicitly teach user manipulation of stored metadata. Interwoven teaches the use of metadata recommendation system with XML Query, allowing user manipulation of stored metadata. Both Christel and Interwoven are directed toward the management of asset metadata using XML and XSL. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Interwoven to Christel, so that the user would

Art Unit: 2176

have the benefit of an easy to use interface that allows users to enter content into form fields and then automatically output the content in XML (Interwoven, p. 4, par. 5).

Regarding dependent claim 11, while Christel does not explicitly teach data manipulation, Interwoven teaches workflow for content manipulation including both review and modification (p. 10-11, Sect. 3.2). Both Christel and Interwoven are directed toward the management of asset metadata using XML and XSL. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Interwoven to Christel, so that the user would have the benefit of an easy to use interface that allows users to enter content into form fields and then automatically output the content in XML (Interwoven, p. 4, par. 5).

Regarding dependent claim 12, Christel teaches data validation of metadata in and the storage of asset metadata in an XML database (p. 293, Sect. 2, Col. 1, par. 5 and Col. 2, par. 3).

Regarding dependent claim 13, while Christel does not explicitly teach that the XML database contains collections of asset types per customer, Interwoven teaches an XML database with segregation of content into branches and separate work areas for users (p. 7, Sect. 2.1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that the separated content could comprise a list of asset metadata files, and that the content could also be segregated per customer, i.e., user. Both Christel and Interwoven are directed toward the management of asset metadata using XML and XSL. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Interwoven to Christel, so that the user would have the

benefit of an easy to use interface that allows users to enter content into form fields and then automatically output the content in XML (Interwoven, p. 4, par. 5).

Regarding dependent claim 14, while Christel teaches the query of an Informedia database with XML results that are validated and data typed via an XML schema (p. 293-294, Fig. 7, p. 294, Col. 1, par. 1), Christel does not explicitly teach allowing a user to search for assets based on the metadata defined in the XML schema for that asset type. However, Interwoven teaches searching XML using XQuery (p. 16, par. 4). Both Christel and Interwoven are directed toward the management of asset metadata using XML and XSL. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Interwoven to Christel, so that the user would have the benefit of an easy to use interface that allows users to enter content into form fields and then automatically output the content in XML (Interwoven, p. 4, par. 5).

Regarding dependent claims 15-16, Christel teaches display of asset metadata in a GUI using the XML file and XSLT (p. 295, Col. 2) for example, relevance, description of asset, etc. The schema file is used to access the asset for display.

Regarding dependent claim 17, Christel teaches previewing the assets at a display using the browser (p. 295, Fig. 8).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 05/15/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. While applicant argues that Christel does not disclose the limitation a *specifier to signify at least one of (a) whether a field is optional or searchable or both or*

Art Unit: 2176

(b) *whether an asset can be handled by a media player through the browser*, (Remarks, p. 7), Christel does disclose specifying whether a field is optional or searchable or both. Applicant's Specification discloses the following definition of specifying an optional field, using a schema: *"For example, a field may be designated as optional by specifying a specific value such as 'minOccurs' and 'maxOccurs'..."* (p. 6, par. 32, l. 3-5). Christel discloses a schema designating an optional field at p. 294, col. 2, par. 2-5, see ln. `<element type="score" maxOccurs="1" />...` and the passage: *These schema definitions limit "score" to appearing at most once for each document...* Therefore, Christel designates the field "score" as optional by specifying a specific "maxOccurs" value.

Further, Christel discloses specifying whether a field is searchable because Christel discloses the use of a relevance score field for searching (p. 295, col. 2, par. 1). Further, Christel discloses an XSL style sheet designating a searchable field at p. 294, col. 2-p. 295, col. 1.

While applicant argues lists the three criteria to establish a prima facie case of obviousness (Remarks, p. 6, par. 3), applicant does not actually argue that any of the three criteria were not met in the previous rejections for obviousness. Instead, applicant's arguments appear to focus on the preamble of independent claim 1, *A method of defining a customizable asset metadata file usable by a web-based asset management application, comprising...* (Remarks, p. 6-7). In response to applicant's arguments, the recitation has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and

where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

Further, both Christel and Interwoven do disclose a method of defining a customizable asset metadata file, since at least the individual fields of each metadata file may be customized. While both Christel and Interwoven use standard metadata schemes, the metadata files themselves are customizable, and the use of a standard metadata schema does not mean that a file may not be customized, for example Christel teaches, *using this common metadata framework as a foundation, more specific metadata could be added to more accurately describe resources in particular video collections* (p. 293, col. 1, par. 1).

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2176

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amelia Rutledge whose telephone number is 571-272-7508. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:30 - 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AR


Heather R. Herndon
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100